

<b>Interview Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	09/826,950	ACOSTA ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
	LaToya I. Cross	1743	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

- (1) Jill Warden. (3) \_\_\_\_.
- (2) Richard Wydeven. (4) \_\_\_\_.

Date of Interview: 19 August 2004.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference  
c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☐ No.  
If Yes, brief description: \_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) discussed: \_\_\_\_.

Identification of prior art discussed: Hewlett.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☒ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Attorney Wydeven explained Applicant's position with respect to the rejection over Hewett. Specifically, Hewett teaches that the receiving structures are fixed onto a movable bed, which did not meet the limitation of "fixed" as recited in the claims. Examiner Warden agreed that the rejection should be withdrawn; however, other references were available that would read on the instant claims. To advance the prosecution of the case and to overcome any references which might be applied, Attorney Wydeven agreed to amend the claims to recite that the positioning structure is located adjacent to each of the receiving structures, which is not taught or suggested by the prior art of record. The amendment is being made in the paper attached to this summary. A notice of allowability is also attached. .